

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

BECKLEY DIVISION

ANTHONY T. HARRELSON,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:10-cv-00441

DAVID BERKEBILE,

Respondent.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

The Court has reviewed the Petitioner's claim filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (Document Nos. 1 and 4.)

By *Standing Order* (Document No. 2) entered on April 2, 2010, this action was referred to the Honorable R. Clarke VanDervort, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission to this Court of proposed findings of fact and recommendation for disposition, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636. On December 3, 2010, the Magistrate Judge submitted *Proposed Findings and Recommendation* (Document No. 17) wherein it is recommended that this Court deny the Petitioner's Motion to Proceed Without Filing Fees, deny the Petitioner's Motion for Summary Judgment, dismiss the Petitioner's Section 2241 Application, and remove this matter from the Court's docket.

Neither party has timely filed objections to the Magistrate Judge's *Proposed Findings and Recommendation*. The Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of *de novo* review and the Petitioner's right to

appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir. 1989); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir. 1984).

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** and incorporates herein the findings and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as contained in the *Proposed Findings and Recommendation*, and **ORDERS** that the Petitioner's Motion to Proceed Without Filing Fees (Document No. 9) be **DENIED**, the Petitioner's Motion for Summary Judgment (Document No. 15) be **DENIED**, the Petitioner's Section 2241 Application (Document Nos. 1 and 4) be **DISMISSED**, and this matter be **REMOVED** from the Court's docket.

The Court has additionally considered whether to grant a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A certificate will not be granted unless there is “a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” Id. § 2253(c)(2). The standard is satisfied only upon a showing that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by this Court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling is likewise debatable. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). The Court concludes that the governing standard is not satisfied in this instance. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability.

The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to send a certified copy of this Order to Magistrate Judge VanDervort, counsel of record, and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: April 21, 2011


IRENE C. BERGER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA